



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,998	01/10/2002	Krishna Kishore Yellepeddy	AUS920010273US1	2727
7590	08/10/2005			EXAMINER
Robert H. Frantz P.O. Box 23324 Oklahoma City, OK 73123			NGUYEN, CINDY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/044,998	YELLEPEDDY ET AL.	
	Examiner Cindy Nguyen	Art Unit 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-11 and 13-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-11 and 13-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to amendment filed 05/25/05.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 05/25/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued Shih is silent as to determining the net difference caused by an update command, generating a differential update command containing only the net differences and propagating the differential update command in place of the original update command. Response to Applicant's argument, these limitations were not claimed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to

promote the "progress of science and the useful" (i.e, the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claims to pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.

In the present case, claims 1 and 19 only recites an abstract idea. The recites steps of for synchronization and propagation of metadirectory updates the steps does not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts as "computer". These steps only constitute an idea of how to construct and compare the differences updated command.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 11, 13-14, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft windows 2000 server "Microsoft Metadirectory services concepts and architecture" (Microsoft) provided by Applicant in view of Shih et al. (US 6615223) (Shih).

Regarding claims 1, 7 and 13 Microsoft discloses: a method, a computer readable medium and a system for synchronization and propagation of metadirectory updates, said metadirectory comprising a plurality of joined heterogeneous data

sources, said data sources comprising one or more entries having one or more attributes, said method comprising the steps of:

selecting by the joiner plug-in a best match entry of said metadirectory to said first entry in the first data source (page 18 to page 19, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, Microsoft); and propagating by said joiner plug-in said differential update command to at least one other joined data source to implement said first update operation (page 8, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, Microsoft). However, Microsoft is silent to disclose: receiving by a joiner plug-in a first update operation for a first entry in a first data source. On the other hand, Shih discloses: receiving by a joiner plug-in a first update operation for a first entry in a first data source (col. 8, lines 42-65, Shih). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the steps for receiving a first update operation for a first entry in a first data source in the system of Microsoft as taught by Shih. The motivation being to enable the system provided the LDAP data operation to update entry as adding, deleting, and modifying the data record in database system and using data operation to organize database.

In addition, Microsoft/Shih discloses: applying said the joiner plug-in said update operation to the local temporary copy of said best matching metadirectory entry (page 15, paragraph "the join action....in the future", Microsoft);

comparing by said joiner plug-in said updated local temporary copy to an original unmodified entry in said metadirectory (page 15, paragraph "the join...in the future"); and

responsive to said step of comparing finding that one or more differences occurred due to the application of said update operation, creating by said joiner plug-in a differential update command containing only changed fields in said updated temporary copy, thereby omitting operation resulting in not net change to said updated temporary copy (page 14, section "the join to page 17, Microsoft).

Regarding claims 2, 8 and 14, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 13 above above, respectively. In addition, Microsoft/Shih discloses: wherein said step of receiving a first update operation comprises receiving an LDAP change operation.

Regarding claims 5, 11 and 17, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 13 above, respectively. In addition, Microsoft/Shih discloses: wherein said step of propagating a differential update command comprises the step of transmitting an LDAP change operation (page 15, third paragraph, Microsoft).

Regarding claim 19 all the limitation of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. Therefore it rejected as above.

Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft windows 2000 server "Microsoft Metadirectory services concepts and architecture" (Microsoft) in view of Shih et al. (US 6615223) (Shih) and further in view of Cappi (US 20020038308).

Regarding claims 3, 9 and 15, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 13 above, respectively. However, Microsoft/Shih didn't disclose: wherein said step of selecting a best match entry of said metadirectory comprises the step of consulting a synonym list to resolve multiple matches. On the other hand, Cappi discloses: wherein said step of selecting a best match entry of said metadirectory comprises the step of consulting a synonym list to resolve multiple matches (page 4, 0056, Cappi). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step of consulting a synonym list to resolve multiple matches in the combination system of Microsoft/Shih as taught by Shih. The motivation being to enable the system provided a dictionary with employed by a user when conducting a search or otherwise retrieving data base on the weights of keyword dictionary (page 4, 0053-0057, Cappi).

Regarding claims 4, 10 and 16, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 13 above, respectively. In addition, Microsoft/Shih/Cappi discloses: wherein said step of selecting a best match entry of said metadirectory comprises the step of performing a weighted scoring analysis across two or more attributes (page 4, 0057, Cappi).

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

#### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4025. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2161

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CAV

Cindy Nguyen

July 27, 2005

*Frantz Coby*  
FRANTZ COBY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER